

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 2, 2004. Claims 1 to 22 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 2, 5, 14, and 19 to 22 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, the Office Action indicates that "some" of the priority documents have been received. However, as this application claims priority from only one Japanese Priority Application, it is believed that the Patent Office has received all priority documents.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 17. Claim 17 has not been amended to be in independent form at this time, as it is believed that its base claim is allowable, as is discussed in more detail below.

The Office Action objected to Claim 17 over an informality. Claim 17 has been amended as suggested, and as such, withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested. Further in this regard, the specification has been amended to correct a similar informality.

Claims 1 to 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15 and 19 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,434,385 (Heinonen) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0060246 (Gobburu). Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Heinonen and Gobburu, and further over U.S. Patent No. 6,072,402 (Kniffin). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Heinonen and Gobburu, and further over U.S. Patent No. 6,625,455 (Ariga). Claims 7, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

over Heinonen and Gobburu, and further over U.S. Patent No. 6,496,703 (da Silva). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Heinonen and Gobburu, and further over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,212 (Weber). Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Heinonen, Gobburu and Weber, and further in view of da Silva. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to entrance/exit regulation of wireless communication terminals, such as a wireless cell phone that might be carried by a person, as well as to restriction of communication of the wireless communication terminal. The wireless communication terminal communicates by first and second wireless communication methods, and uses the first wireless communication method to communicate with an entrance/exit regulating apparatus. This communication includes an indication signal which indicates a communication restriction of the second wireless communication method of the wireless communication terminal. Entrance/exit of the wireless communication terminal is controlled on the basis of the communication by the first wireless communication method. In addition, the wireless communication terminal restricts communication by the second wireless communication method in accordance with the indication signal. In this way, a first wireless communication method can be used to regulate the exit/entrance of a wireless communication terminal, as well as to control a communication restriction for a second wireless communication method used by the wireless communication terminal. As such, the communication capability of the wireless communication terminal may be controlled based on an exit/entrance status with reference to an entrance/exit regulating apparatus.

### Independent Claims 1 and 19

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 1 recites a system having an entrance/exit regulating apparatus for regulating an entrance/exit of a person and a wireless communication terminal for communicating with the entrance/exit regulating apparatus. The entrance/exit regulating apparatus comprises transmission means for transmitting, by a first wireless communication method, an indication signal for indicating a communication restriction of a second wireless communication method of the wireless communication terminal, and first control means for regulating an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with the wireless communication terminal by the first wireless communication method. The wireless communication terminal comprises first communication means for communicating with the entrance/exit regulating apparatus by the first wireless communication method, second communication means for communication by the second wireless communication method, and second control means for restricting communication of the second communication means in accordance with the indication signal received from the transmission means by the first wireless communication method.

Independent Claim 19 is a method claim that corresponds generally to the system of independent Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 1 and 19, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of transmitting, by a first wireless communication method, an indication signal for indicating

a communication restriction of a second wireless communication method of the wireless communication terminal, regulating an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with the wireless communication terminal by the first wireless communication method, and restricting communication of a second wireless communication method in accordance with the indication signal received by the first wireless communication method.

Heinonen relates to a method for eliminating the disturbance caused by a mobile station situated within a certain area. The mobile station is provided with control means for muting the mobile station in response to a predetermined message transmitted to the mobile station by a transmitting means arranged in a certain area (see Abstract). However, Heinonen is not seen to teach that the mobile station is able to communicate with both a first and second wireless communication method, wherein the first communication method includes an indication signal which indicates a communication restriction on the second wireless communication method. Rather, Heinonen is seen to teach that the base station that sends the muting signal is capable of transmitting on the general transmission channel BCCH of the GSM-system, or may be a complete GSM base station (column 4, lines 11-19). As such, the communication method for muting Heinonen's mobile station is seen to be the same as the general communication method for the mobile stations (i.e. GSM).

Furthermore, as conceded by the Office Action, Heinonen fails to teach regulating the entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with the wireless communication terminal. The Office Action contends that Gobburu teaches this

feature. However, Gobburu is seen to teach the use of a readable bar code displayed on a mobile phone (see page 10, paragraph 83). Gobburu is not seen to teach a wireless communication terminal that communicates with an entrance/exit regulating apparatus via a first wireless communication method, wherein entrance/exit of a person is regulated in accordance with communication with the wireless communication terminal by the first wireless communication method.

The remaining art applied against the claims, namely Kniffen, Ariga, da Silva, and Weber, is not seen to supply what is missing from Heinonen and Gobburu. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 19 are believed to be allowable.

#### Independent Claims 2 and 20

According to another aspect of the present invention, independent Claim 2 recites a system having an entrance/exit regulating apparatus for regulating an entrance/exit of a person and having a server apparatus for managing an entrance/exit of a person. The entrance/exit regulating apparatus comprises restriction means for restricting, in accordance with communication with the wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method, communication of a wireless communication terminal carried by a person whose entrance/exit is to be regulated, wherein the communication of the wireless communication terminal is by a second wireless communication method. The entrance/exit regulating apparatus further comprises notification means for notifying the server apparatus of an indication that the wireless communication terminal whose communication was restricted by the restriction means exists in a predetermined area. The server apparatus

comprises management means for managing an existence location of the wireless communication terminal in accordance with a notice supplied from the notification means.

Independent Claim 20 is a method claim that corresponds generally to the system of independent Claim 2.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 2 and 20, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of restricting, in accordance with communication with the wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method, communication of a wireless communication terminal carried by a person whose entrance/exit is to be regulated, wherein the communication of the wireless communication terminal is by a second wireless communication method.

As discussed above, Heinonen is not seen to teach restricting communication of a wireless communication terminal in accordance with communication by a first wireless communication method, wherein the communication to be restricted is a second wireless communication method.

The remaining art applied against the claims, namely Gobburu, Kniffen, Ariga, da Silva, and Weber, is not seen to supply what is missing from Heinonen and Gobburu. Accordingly, independent Claims 2 and 20 are believed to be allowable.

#### Independent Claims 5 and 21

According to another aspect of the present invention, independent Claim 5 recites an entrance/exit regulating apparatus for regulating an entrance/exit of a person.

The apparatus comprises transmission means for transmitting an indication signal to a wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method, the indication signal for restricting communication, by a second wireless communication method, of the wireless communication terminal. The apparatus further comprises control means for regulating an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with the wireless communication terminal by the first wireless communication method.

Independent Claim 21 is a method claim that corresponds generally to the apparatus of independent Claim 5.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 5 and 21, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of transmitting an indication signal to a wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method, the indication signal for restricting communication, by a second wireless communication method, of the wireless communication terminal.

As discussed above, Heinonen is not seen to teach restricting communication of a wireless communication terminal in accordance with communication by a first wireless communication method, wherein the communication to be restricted is a second wireless communication method.

The remaining art applied against the claims, namely Gobburu, Kniffen, Ariga, da Silva, and Weber, is not seen to supply what is missing from Heinonen and Gobburu. Accordingly, independent Claims 5 and 21 are believed to be allowable.

### Independent Claims 14 and 22

According to another aspect of the present invention, independent Claim 14 recites a wireless communication terminal comprising first communication means for communicating with an entrance/exit regulating apparatus for regulating an entrance/exit of a person by a first wireless communication method, second communication means for communication by a second wireless communication method, and control means for restricting communication of the second communication means in accordance with an instruction from the entrance/exit regulating apparatus received by the first communication means.

Independent Claim 22 is a method claims that corresponds generally to the apparatus of independent Claim 14.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 14 and 22.

As discussed above, Heinonen is not seen to teach restricting communication of a wireless communication terminal in accordance with communication by a first wireless communication method, wherein the communication to be restricted is a second wireless communication method.

The remaining art applied against the claims, namely Gobburu, Kniffen, Ariga, da Silva, and Weber, is not seen to supply what is missing from Heinonen and Gobburu. Accordingly, independent Claims 14 and 22 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied reference for at least the same



reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael K. O'Neill", written over a horizontal line.

Michael K. O'Neill  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 88215v1